

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA  
WHEELING**

**MATTHEW TAYLOR,**

Petitioner,

v.

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:19-CV-291  
(BAILEY)**

**R. HUGGINS, Warden,**

Respondent.

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

On this day, the above-styled matter came before this Court for consideration of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge James P. Mazzone [Doc. 6]. Pursuant to this Court's Local Rules, this action was referred to Magistrate Judge Mazzone for submission of a proposed report and a recommendation ("R&R"). Magistrate Judge Mazzone filed his R&R on November 5, 2019, wherein he recommends the § 2241 petition be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c), this Court is required to make a *de novo* review of those portions of the magistrate judge's findings to which objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). In addition, failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of *de novo*

review and the right to appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Snyder v. Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984). Here, objections to Magistrate Judge Mazzone's R&R were due within fourteen (14) days of receipt, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Fed.R.Civ.P. 72(b). The docket indicates the petitioner accepted service on November 7, 2019 [Doc. 7]. To date, no objections have been filed. Accordingly, the R&R will be reviewed for clear error.

Upon careful review of the above, it is the opinion of this Court that the **Report and Recommendation [Doc. 6]** should be, and is, hereby **ORDERED ADOPTED** for the reasons more fully stated in the magistrate judge's report. Accordingly, the petitioner's § 2241 petition [Doc. 1] is **DENIED** and **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** for lack of jurisdiction. The petitioner's Motion for Leave to Proceed IFP [Doc. 2] is **DENIED AS MOOT**. The Clerk is **DIRECTED** to **STRIKE** this case from the active docket of this Court and to enter judgment in favor of the respondent.

It is so **ORDERED**.

The Clerk is directed to transmit copies of this Order to any counsel of record and to mail a copy to the *pro se* petitioner.

**DATED:** December 2, 2019.

  
JOHN PRESTON BAILEY  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE